REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 10, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1 and 3-9 were pending and rejected claims 1 and 3-9. Claims 1, 3-5 and 8 have been amended, claims 7 and 9 have been cancelled, new claims 10 and 11 have been added; and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10 and 11 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are respectfully traversed below.

Objection to Drawings

The Office Action, on page 2, objected to the Fig. 7 of the drawings because the reference numbers in Fig. 7 were incorrect. Applicants have submitted Fig. 7 (replacement sheet and annotated sheet) indicating that reference number 1 has been correctly changed to reference number 3. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In item 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5 and 8 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for indefiniteness. Claim 1 has been amended to remove the limitation of "ID information" and "recording a process ID into ID information". Claims 5 and 8 have been similarly amended. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 5 and 8 satisfy the requirements under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In item 8 on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,807,539, hereinafter "Miller").

Miller is directed to a method and system for retrieving search results concurrently from multiple disparate databases, whether such databases are available through Web, or other proprietary internal networks (see Miller, Abstract and col. 2, lines 16-21). According to Miller, an authentication manager provides a means to access user authentication information stored in a central database (see Miller, col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 1). In contrast, claim 1 requires that "a script definition ... for ... information retrieval sites in which an authentication **is unnecessary**" is recorded into the database. Miller does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature because Miller describes accessing user authentication information stored in a central database rather than storing into the storage "a script definition ... for ... authentication information retrieval sites

in which an authentication **is unnecessary**". Therefore, Miller teaches away with respect to this feature.

Further, the Office Action alleged that col. 8, line 65-col. 9, line 27; col. 4, lines 9-14; and col. 1, lines 24-25 of Miller disclose

> recording predetermined sets of authentication information and ID information into said storage for each of said information retrieval sites that require authentication and restrict number of accesses, the authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said information retrieval sites.

However, claim 1, as amended, recites

> *recording predetermined number of pieces of authentication information* into said storage *for each of said information retrieval sites that require authentication and restrict number of accesses*, said authentication information being assigned to said server by each of said information retrieval sites.

It is submitted that Miller does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature because, as previously mentioned, col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 27 of Miller describes using an authentication manager to acquire authentication information used to gain access on the user's behalf. Further, col. 1, lines 24-65 of Miller describes that certain databases require subscriptions and a person who wants to access such a database would have to subscribe to the database individually. Additionally, col. 4, lines 10-14 of Miller lists various database providers. Stated another way, the above-mentioned cited portions of Miller are merely concerned with databases that required subscriptions and the use of an authentication manager to access such databases by authentication.

It should be noted that "requir[ing] authentication and restrict[ing] number of accesses" are distinct. Therefore, in view of the above, the cited portions of Miller fail to disclose or suggest "information retrieval sites that ... restrict number of accesses" because Miller is merely concerned with accessing databases that require subscriptions and does not teach how and why "predetermined pieces of authentication information" is recorded with respect to "information retrieval sites that require authentication and **restrict number of accesses**".

Further, claim 1, as amended, recites

> identifying a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes from among pieces of authentication information corresponding to said information retrieval site designated by said user terminal when said script definition read in said reading step defines the authentication function.

It is submitted that Miller does not teach or suggest the above-mentioned feature because Miller describes using translators to control and manage authentication when databases are accessed (see Miller, col. 8, lines 30-32). According to Miller, each translator needs to establish an

authentication session with that database (see Miller, col. 8, lines 33-35). The translator performs the required sequence of page fetches, cookie management, and session ID management required to authenticate (see Miller, col. 8, lines 35-37). Further, the other cited portions, for example col. 9 of Miller, describe using an authentication manager to access the database.

Therefore, in light of the above, Miller is silent as to the above-mentioned feature recited in claim 1. This silent is not surprising because Miller is merely concerned with using a translator or the authentication manager, as previously described above, to gain access on the user's behalf rather than "identifying a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes from among pieces of authentication information" as required by claim 1.

Thus, in view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Miller.

Further, independent claims 5 and 8 have been amended to emphasize similar features as claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 5 and 8 are patentable over Miller for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims 3, 4 and 6 are patentable over Miller for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims, from which they depend.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim

New claim 10 emphasizes the feature of "waiting until a piece of authentication information unused by other cross-site search processes appears when all of the pieces of authentication information corresponding to said information retrieval site designated by said user terminal are used by other cross-site search processes". Applicant respectfully submits that Miller does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature. Therefore, it is submitted that new claim 10 is patentable over Miller.

New claim 11 has been added to recite

11. (New) A method, comprising:
recording, in a storage, a script definition for each site that does not require authentication, a script definition for an authentication function for each site that requires authentication, and a predetermined number of pieces of authentication information for each site that requires authentication and restrict the number of accesses;
generating a search process when a user designates a site to be searched with a search condition;

transmitting a piece of authentication information identified as corresponding to the site designated by the user based on the script definition read from the storage;

receiving an authentication from a site requiring authentication after the piece of authentication information that corresponds to the site is transmitted to the site;

receiving search results from the site after a search request that includes a search condition is transmitted to the site; and

transmitting the search results received from the site to the user.

It is submitted that Miller fails to teach or suggest the above-mentioned features recited in claim 11. Particularly, it is submitted that Miller fails to teach or suggest "recording, in a storage, *a script definition for each site that does not require authentication*, a script definition for an authentication function for each site that requires authentication, and a predetermined number of pieces of authentication information for each site that requires authentication and restrict the number of accesses ... [and] *transmitting a piece of authentication information identified as corresponding to the site designated by the user based on the script definition read from the storage*". Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over Miller.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 10, 2008

By: _____
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501